

Docket No: DONAT-2
Appl. No: 10/770,121

REMARKS

The last Office Action of January 13, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. New claims 8-12 have been added. Claims 1, and 3-12 remain in this application.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowability of claim 7, but wishes to postpone amendments to claim 7 in view of the Remarks presented below.

Claims 1 and 5 are objected to because of certain informalities which have been overcome by the amendments to claims 1 and 5.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,698,766 to Entwistle et al. (hereinafter "Entwistle").

It is noted with appreciation that claim 7 is indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, applicant wishes to defer amendments to this dependent claim in view of the arguments presented below regarding amended claims 1 and 5.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 5, on file, recites that a type-specific communication protocol is

Docket No: DONAT-2
Appl. No: 10/770,121

associated with each component type, that at least one component of the plurality of components is designated as being a hierarchically superior component, with the remaining components of the plurality of components being designated as subordinate components, and that communication between the superior component and the subordinate components is enabled via the type-specific communication protocol.

Entwiste discloses communication between superior components and subordinate components via a device- or device-type-independent communication protocol. Stated differently, Entwiste fails to disclose that a type-specific communication protocol is associated with each component type, which is then used for communication between the respective subordinate component and the superior component, as recited in original claim 5. The amendments to claim 5 only relate to the claim objection and are not substantive. Since Entwiste does not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 5, claim 5 is not anticipated by Entwiste, and allowance of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the corresponding features of claim 5 and should be allowable for the same reasons that claim 5 is allowable.

As for the rejection of the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claims 1 and 5, respectively, share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Applicant also wishes to point out that Entwiste discloses a system where several machines are addressed/controlled by a superior controller (computer), whereas the present invention is directed to controlling a drive system of a

Docket No: DONAT-2
Appl. No: 10/770,121

machine, wherein the drive system has several components. Stated differently, the invention is directed to controlling a number of components located in a single machine, rather than several machines.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and allowance of claims 1, and 3-12 are thus respectfully requested.

CITED REFERENCES

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the

Docket No: DONAT-2
Appl. No: 10/770,121

Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: April 11, 2005
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:WS:ub